



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,573	06/07/2000	Michael C. Lewis	945P/BP1413	1314

7590 09/24/2002

Sawyer Law Group LLP
P O Box 51418
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMBINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2671

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/589,573

Applicant(s)

LEWIS, MICHAEL C.

Examiner

Kimbinh T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2671

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 September 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: NONE.

Claim(s) objected to: NONE.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 10-15.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to incorporate the limitations of claims 3 and 4, reciting that each of the positions corresponds to a pixel in the display. These limitations if they are applied into independent claims 1 and 10 whether or not the claimed invention would change the scope of the invention and would require further consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the Final Office Action, claims 1-8 and 10-15 are pending in the application. In the proposed amendment, claims 4 and 13 have been canceled and incorporated the limitations into independent claims 1 and 10; however, claims 4 and 13 reciting each of the position corresponds to a pixel in the display, this feature as taught by Watkin's reference (see Final Office Action). With respect to Applicant's Arguments, Watkin performs anti-aliasing images, image data is composed from primitives (polygons) to attain data for displays and smooth-appearing edges, figs. 1-4 show planes, areas, polygons and individual pixel (or pixel-by-pixel), edge intersection for anti-aliasing procedures. Claim 1, both Watkin in view of Foran suggest a method of improving anti-aliasing images with rendering individual picture elements (pixels) (Watkin, col. 1, lines 22-23; Foran, col. 5, line 16); the steps from a-e as explained in the Final Office Action. Further, Watkin provides masks (mask bits of the pixel record is set to "one") for objects intersecting (col. 12, lines 3-6), anti-aliasing the objects intersecting the current pixel, performing objects intersecting subsequent pixels (col. 13, lines 11-16). Foran also discloses using masks to perform anti-aliasing, develops a region mask based on coverage mask within each pixel, the processing of anti-aliasing based on pixel-by-pixel basis, compares new pixel data to old pixel data and updated pixel data into the memory (col. 5, lines 11-23). In conclusion, arguments are not persuasive because Applicants are relying on limitations in a proposed amendment that has not been entered and also has been rejected in the Office Final Action.